

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DA	TE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/506,693	04/21/200	05	Kurt Berlin	47675-86	4705
22504	7590 08/21/2006		EXAMINER		
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP				SALMON, KATHERINE D	
	JRY SQUARE TH AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688				1634	

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/506,693	BERLIN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Katherine Salmon	1634				
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for	• •						
WHIC - Extens after S - If NO - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (b) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, uply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Ap	oril 2005.					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.					
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
1	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositio	on of Claims						
4)🛛	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.					
Application	on Papers						
9) 🗌 7	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
- 5	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment		0					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-17 and 19-20, drawn to a method for detecting the presence or absence of a medical condition in a tissue, cell type, or organ of an individual

Group II, claim(s) 18, drawn to kit comprising a surface to bind DNA floating in a sample, a means for detecting, reagents, a container, and a means to control.

The inventions listed as Groups I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features. According to PCT Rule 13.2, unity of invention exists only when a shared same or corresponding special technical feature is a contribution over the prior art. The technical feature, which is shared by Groups I-II, is free floating DNA in serum. Groups I-II do not share a special technical feature over the art because Eppstein et al. (US Patent 5622712 April 22, 1997) teaches a DNA-liposome complex that is free floating in a suspension (serum) (Column 18

Art Unit: 1634

lines 19-30). Therefore Eppstein et al. teaches the technical feature of free floating DNA in serum and Groups I-II do not share a special technical feature over the art.

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/506,693 Page 4

Art Unit: 1634

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/506,693

Art Unit: 1634

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Katherine Salmon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3316.

Page 5

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8AM-430PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Katherine Salmon

Kathe Ilmor

Examiner

Art Unit 1634

BJ FORMAN, PH.D.